

**REMARKS**

The following remarks are prepared in response to the Office Action of July 13, 2004. Claims 27-29, 31, 35, 61 and 63 are to be pending in this application, after entry of this amendment.

The specification was objected to because of minor informalities. Claim 29 was objected to because of minor informalities. Claims 27-29, 31, 35, 61 and 63 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter. Claims 27, 29 and 35 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sasaki et al. ("Sasaki", U.S. Patent No. 6,353,287) in view of Kimura et al. ("Kimura", U.S. Patent No. 6,352,656). The remaining rejections are moot in view of the canceled claims.

**Objection to the Specification**

The Examiner objected to the specification because the Brief Description of the Drawings refers to Fig. 4 and Fig. 41 but the drawings contain Figs. 4A, 4B and Figs. 41A, 41B. Applicant has amended the specification to correct the minor informalities to the Brief Description of the Drawings. Therefore, Applicant respectfully requests the Examiner to withdraw the objection to the specification in view of the amendments.

**Objection to Claim 29**

The Examiner objected to claim 29 because the limitation is unclear. Applicant has amended claim 29 to correct the unclear claim language. Therefore, Applicant respectfully requests the Examiner to withdraw the objection to claim 29 in view of the amendment.

**Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. § 112, Second Paragraph**

**Claims 27-29, 31, 35, 61 and 63**

Claim 27 has been amended to remove the recitations to “the first member” to overcome the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph. Therefore, Applicant respectfully requests the Examiner to withdraw the rejection to claim 27 and claims 28-29, 31, 35, 61 and 63, which depend from claim 27.

**Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)**

**Independent Claim 27**

Claim 27 recites a display panel manufacturing method including an attachment process, a first removing process, and a bonding agent filling process. The attachment process is to attach a bonding agent positioning member, which is different and separate from the barrier ribs, to the barrier ribs. The first removing process forms a groove along each barrier rib top. The bonding agent filling process places the bonding agent on the tops of the barrier ribs by filling the grooves with the bonding agent.

By contrast, in figure 6, Sasaki discloses that while the bonding members 15 are applied by such a technique as screen printing or transferring by means of a stamper, the bonding members 15 may also be provided by lift-off or the like before applying the fluorescent substance 11 thereon. Col. 16, lns. 27-31. Also in case the division walls 7 are formed through a plurality of screen printing operations, the bonding members 15 can be provided by forming only the uppermost layer from frit glass or the like, or alternatively, the frit glass or the like that makes the bonding members 15 may be applied to predetermined portions of the upper panel substrate 4 which correspond to the division walls 7 provided on the lower panel substrate 8. Col. 16, lns. 31-38. In screen printing, it is common to form a pattern through which an adhesive

material of predetermined viscosity passes for a screen plate that makes contact with the ridges of the division walls 7, the bonding members 15 may also be provided only on the ridges of the division walls 7 by screen printing, after making the screen plate through the entire surface of which the adhesive material can pass. Col. 16, Ins. 38-45. In summary, Sasaki discloses forming holes on the tops of the barrier ribs themselves and filling the holes with a bonding agent. Sasaki does not disclose an attachment process for attaching a bonding agent positioning member, which is different and separate from the barrier ribs, to the barrier ribs. Furthermore, the Examiner acknowledges the inadequacy of Sasaki to disclose a first removing process for removing parts of the bonding agent positioning member attached to the barrier rib top's at positions corresponding to the specific pattern, to form a groove along each barrier rib top. The Examiner, however, attempts to overcome such inadequacy by employing Kimura's process for forming grooves with laser light.

Kimura aims to provide a manufacturing method for a metallic stamper and a metallic stamper, and a manufacturing method for optical disk substrates with the use of the metallic stamper and optical disks produced by the manufacturing method, which can finely form grooves, or grooves and pits of optical disk substrates with high density, thereby realizing large-capacity optical disks and reducing a noise level. Col. 2, Ins. 33-41. Hence, Kimura forms grooves using a metallic stamper. By contrast, claim 27 recites that the grooves are formed by a first removing process for removing parts of the bonding agent positioning member attached to the barrier rib top's at positions corresponding to the specific pattern.

Therefore, the inadequacy of Sasaki is not satisfied by the combination of Kimura as suggested by the Examiner; so even if the proposed combination was disclosed, taught or suggested by the cited art, which it is not, the combination would still be inadequate to render

claim 27 unpatentable. Furthermore, both Sasaki and Kimura fail to provide a motivation to combine a method for manufacturing plasma display panels (Sasaki) with a method for manufacturing optical disk substrates (Kimura). Accordingly, the rejection of claim 27 should be withdrawn.

Dependent Claims 28, 29, 31, 35, 61 and 63

Applicant appreciates the indication from the Examiner that claims 28, 31 and 61 would be allowable if rewritten to overcome the rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, and to include all the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Claims 28, 29, 31, 35, 61 and 63 all depend from independent claim 27. All these dependent claims define the display panel manufacturing method greater particularity and thus further distinguish over Sasaki, Kimura and the other references of record. For this reason, and for the reasons set forth above with respect to independent claim 27, the rejections of these dependent claims should be withdrawn.

The other references of record have been reviewed in this case and do not disclose, teach or suggest the present invention as recited by the claims either individually or in any combination.

**Conclusion**

If the Examiner believes that a telephone interview will help further the prosecution of this case, he is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned attorney at the listed telephone number.

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service as First Class Mail in an envelope addressed to the Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450 on October 7, 2004.

By: Rachel Carter

Rachel Carter  
Signature

Dated: October 7, 2004

Very truly yours,

**SNELL & WILMER L.L.P.**

Ketan S. Vakil

Ketan S. Vakil  
Registration No. 43,215  
1920 Main Street, Suite 1200  
Irvine, California 92614-7230  
Telephone: (949) 253-4905